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Jeanne Ellyawati¹, Basu Swastha Dharmmesta¹, Bernardinus M. Purwanto¹ and Hester Van Herk²

¹Faculty of Economics Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University, Indonesia
²Faculty of Economics and Business Administration Vrije University, The Netherlands

This study examines the model of consumer perceptions of service recovery in the context of service failure. Adopting the concept of justice theory, this study is to investigate the influence of perceived justice and its impact on recovery satisfaction. The data used in this study were collected based on laboratory experimental design. The 381 graduate students were recruited from Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University and Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia as participants. Hypothesis testing was employed by ANOVA and regression analysis. The finding of the study showed that both of complainers and non-complainers who experience service failure are more interested in receiving service recovery in a proper compensation and communication from the service provider. There is a tendency that perceived recovery justice of non-complainers is more positive than those of complainers. Furthermore, it is found that those of the three dimensions of justice, perceived interpersonal justice has the highest response. Regression analysis shows that the three-dimension of perceived justice partially as well as simultaneously effect on recovery satisfaction positively.
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INTRODUCTION

No matter how the service provider served customers, service failures is always happened. Service failure can lead to negative disconfirmation and ultimately dissatisfaction (Michel & Meuter, 2008). Consumer dissatisfaction to the service providers can endanger the business organization itself. When consumers are not satisfied with the purchase experience, they usually perform multi response (Ellyawati, 2011). Their response can be varies, ranging from no action at all to the millions of dollars suing for losses experienced (Day et al., 1981).

To restore customer satisfaction that caused by service failure, the service provider can provide service recovery efforts (Michel & Meuter, 2008). Service recovery is a consequence of service failure that concerned to the service organization's response management to the failures occurred. Implementation of an effective recovery technique allows managers to retain existing customers, increase customer loyalty (Miller et al., 2000; Chang, 2008; Zeithaml, et al., 2006; Blodget et al., 1997; Maxham & Netemeyer, 2003), and can even lead to a paradoxical situation
(McCullough, 2009). Recovery strategy becomes especially important for companies to maintain and develop good relationships with customers in the long run.

The purpose of this study is to test empirically the phenomenon of service recovery and its impact on customer satisfaction in the context of service failure. Using theory of justice as the basis, researchers aim to build and test a model of consumer behavior in the context of failure and recovery issue.

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT AND HYPOTHESES

Perceived distributive justice

Distributive justice derived from social exchange theory and equity theory (Adams, 1963) and refers to the outcomes received by an individual in that social exchange. According to Kreitner & Kinicki (2008) distributive justice is the perceived fairness in how resources and rewards are distributed. Meanwhile, according to Homans, the concept of distributive justice in the exchange relationship occurs when the benefits received by each individual is proportional to the investment (Whiteside, 1974).

Some of past empirical studies stated that perceived distributive justice effects on service recovery evaluation positively (Goodw & Ross, 1992, Smith e.t., 1999). Gustafsson (2009) in his study stated that when a consumer experienced a good service recovery, then they are likely to perceive a high level of justice, creating a positive attitude to service providers (attitudinal loyalty) and increase the likelihood of repurchase intention in the future (behavioral loyalty). In contrast, consumers who have a low service recovery tend to perceive a low justice. Thus, the argument leads to the following hypothesis:

H1a: There is a difference perceived distributive justice between complainers who received high service recovery and low service recovery.

H1b: There is a difference perceived distributive justice between non-complainers who received high service recovery and low service recovery.

Non-Complainers who received low service recovery are likely perceived distributive justice more positive than the complainers. Moreover when non-complainers received high service recovery, it will lead to a more positive perceived distributive justice than complainers. It could be realized that non-complainer do not have to argue with service provider and he or she already had received the compensation. Whereas complainers although already asked for compensation, but they obtained similar compensation with non-complainers. Thus, the argument leads to the following hypothesis:

H1c: There is a difference perceived distributive justice between complainers and non-complainers who both received high service recovery.

H1d: There is a difference perceived distributive justice between complainers and non-complainers who both received low service recovery.
Perceived procedural justice

Procedural justice refers to whether the policies, procedures and criteria used by decision-makers to solve the problem are fair (Blodgett, 1997; Karande et al., 2007). Laventhal and his colleagues concluded that a fair procedure must be consistent, unbiased and impartial, representing all stakeholders and based on accurate and ethical standards (Kou & Loh, 2006; Blodgett, 1997). Procedural justice includes the meaning of how decisions are made and conflicts are solved.

Thibaut and Walker (1975; Cutt et al., 2006) stated that procedural justice theory is one of the reactive process theories. Procedural justice is very important in service recovery. A consumer may satisfy with one type of service recovery strategy offered by service provider but become dissatisfied when the process of obtaining compensation runs slowly (Kelley et al., 1993; Hoffman & Kelley, 2000). It can be said that the faster service recovery procedures, the higher the perceived procedural justice (Blodgett, et al., 1997; Hoffman & Kelley, 2000; Ha & Jang, 2009).

H2a: There is a difference perceived procedural justice between complainers who received high service recovery and low service recovery.

H2b: There is a difference perceived procedural justice between non-complainers who received high service recovery and low service recovery.

Non-complainers who receive initial service recovery are likely to perceive procedural justice better than the complainers. This is because they do not spend time and effort for obtaining the recovery service, but they already obtained it. Meanwhile, complainers must be struggle with effort and spend much time to obtain the service recovery. Based on these arguments, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2c: There is a difference perceived procedural justice between complainers and non-complainers who both received high service recovery.

H2d: There is a difference perceived procedural justice between complainers and non-complainers who both received low service recovery.

Perceived interactional justice

Interactional justice is related to individual behaviors in treating consumers during the procedure recovery (Tax et al., 1999; Erdogan, 2002; Hui et al., 2007). Blodgett et al. (1997) cited from some experts, said that interactional justice refers to the attitude in which consumers are treated during the process of conflict resolution. The higher service provider staffs interact to customers, the higher consumer perceptions of interactional justice will be (Hoffman & Kelley, 2000; Ha & Jang, 2009). Bitner et al. (1990) put more emphasis on interaction in the form of hospitality of service provider staffs. He said that consumers will react positively if the service failure from the early be complemented with friendly service recovery. Thus, the argument leads to the following hypothesis:
H3a: There is a difference perceived interactional justice between complainers who received high service recovery and low service recovery.

H3b: There is a difference perceived interactional justice between non-complainers who received high service recovery and low service recovery.

Service provider will benefit high quality of reputation if it can resolve the problem immediately; have a good access and fast response to customers (Hocutt et al., 1997). With immediate recovery and the right services, it is expected that consumers will perceive interactional justice positively. Moreover, if the consumer does not complain but obtain recovery, consumers will perceive service recovery justice more positively. The better the service provider treat consumers, the higher the consumer perceive interactional justice. Thus, the argument leads to the following hypothesis:

H3c: There is a difference perceived interactional justice between complainers and non-complainers who both received high service recovery.

H3d: There is a difference perceived interactional justice between complainers and non-complainers who both received low service recovery.

Service recovery satisfaction

Theory of justice is built on the concept of three-dimensional of justice which is included distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Blodgett et al., 1997; McColl-Kennedy & Sparks, 2003; McCole, 2003). In a previous study, the three dimensions of justice proved that those variables affect satisfaction (Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002; Smith et al. 1999). Generally, perceived justice dimensions hypothesized as antecedents of cognition that affect satisfaction directly (Tax et al., 1998; Smith & Bolton, 2002). Consumers will determine their opinion on the basis of which the recovery process is considered sufficiently, it means that there is a positive effect on satisfaction. McCollough (1992) in his study found that the effect of service recovery on satisfaction is not linear. It means that high service recovery does not lead to high customer satisfaction, in reverse low services recovery does not lead to lower satisfaction.

Some of researches are focus on the study dimension of justice partially and its impact on satisfaction. In his research McCollough et al. (2000) suggest that the distributive justice and interactional justice variables is important predictor for post-recovery satisfaction (McCollough et al., 2000). While Spark and McColl-Kennedy (1998) and Karande et al. (2007) in their study focus more on the non-compensation recovery, those are procedural justice and interactional justice. They stated that although distributive justice (compensation) is important in service recovery, but how the process is resolved, the way the compensation was distributed, extremely determine to consumer satisfaction. Thus the overall effect of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice are very important to measure customer satisfaction. Thus, the argument leads to the following hypothesis:

H4a: Perceived distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice partially affect to service recovery satisfaction positively.
H4b: Perceived distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice simultaneously affect service recovery satisfaction positively.

METHODOLOGY

To test hypothesis, this study used between subject experimental design with 2x2x2x3 factorial design. Stimulus of service failure consists of two different designs, namely high and low service recovery with three variables of perceived justice. The experimental group was distinguished between complainers and non-complainers. Therefore the combination of variables and categories made 16 types of scenarios.

Sample

Samples are required a minimum of 20 people per cell. The total of 381 participants were recruited from classes at 2 universities, there are Atma Jaya Yogyakarta University and Gadjah Mada University. Based on the gender characteristics, most participants are male (63.5%), aged between 21 years to 25 years (43%). In addition to being students, most participants are working as a civil or non-educational employees in various private and public institutions (36.7%). They attend to Magister programs in different faculties, those are: Economics and Business, Civil Engineering, Architect, Informatics Technology, and Law. Based on the school they attend, most participants are studying in Master of Management program (57.2%) at the University of Gadjah Mada (55.1%).

Procedure

Experiment was conducted in the classroom. Each participant was distributed a booklet randomly. To answer the questions, we use paper and pencil test method. After participants read the scenario of service failure, they have to make a choice whether they will complaint to the service provider or not. We set up service recovery scenario in red and blue papers. Participants who decided to complain to service provider must open a red page, instead of the blue one and vice versa. Complainers and non-complainers are distributed with different stimulus, because each has different form of service characteristics.

Measures

All constructs in current study were measured with multi-item scale adopted from literatures. The distributive justice instrument were adopted from Smith et al. (1999); Blodgett et al. (1997). Whereas procedural and interactional justice instruments were adopted from Blodgett et al. (1997); Smith et al. (1999); Rio-Lanza et al. (2008). The same scales of recovery satisfaction was used as in Bitner (1990); Davidow (2000); Rio-Lanza et al. (2008). Research instruments were modified in accordance with the objectives of the study. All constructs using a 5-point Likert scale from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).
RESULT

Based on the data obtained, a total of 220 participants are complainers and 161 consumer participants are non-complainers. To investigate differences of consumers perception among experimental groups, the following are the results of ANOVA:

Perceived distributive justice complainers and non-complainers

Among the 220 participants who complained to service provider and received service recovery, there are 117 participants perceive high distributive justice. The remaining 103 participants perceive low distributive justice. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=220)}=21.540; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H1a is supported. Among 161 participants who did not complain but receive initial service recovery, there are 71 participants perceive high distributive justice, while as many as 90 participants perceive low distributive justice. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=161)}=17.688; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H1b is supported.

The data collected shows that 188 participants perceive high distributive justice and 193 consumers perceive low distributive justice. Among the 188 participants who perceive high distributive justice, there are 117 complainers and 71 non-complainers. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=188)}=24.190; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H1c is supported. Among the 193 participants who perceive low distributive justice, there are 103 complainers and 90 non-complainers. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=193)}=25.367; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H1d is supported.

Perceived procedural justice complainers and non-complainers

Among the 220 participants who complained to service provider and received service recovery, there are 117 participants perceive high procedural justice. The remaining 103 participants perceive low procedural justice. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=220)}=2.977; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H2a is not supported. Among 161 participants who did not complain but receive initial service recovery, there are 80 participants perceive high procedural justice, while as many as 81 participants perceive low procedural justice. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=161)}=3.496 ; \ p>0.05$. Thus hypothesis H2b is not supported.

The data collected shows that 183 participants perceive high procedural justice and 198 consumers perceive low procedural justice. Among the 183 participants who perceive high procedural justice, there are 103 complainers and 80 non-complainers. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=183)}=7.867; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H2c is supported. Among the 198 participants who perceive low procedural justice, there are 117 complainers and 81 non-complainers. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,n=198)}=8.610; \ p<0.05$. Thus hypothesis H2d is supported.

Perceived interational justice complainers and non-complainers

Among the 220 participants who complained to service provider and received service recovery, there are 112 participants perceive high interactional justice. The remaining 103 participants perceive low interactional justice. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(df=1,220)}=89.920; \ p<0.05$. 
Thus hypothesis H3a is supported. Among 161 participants who did not complain but receive initial service recovery, there are 76 participants perceive high interational justice. The remaining 85 participants perceive low interational justice. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(1,160)} = 68.642, p < 0.05$. Thus hypothesis H3b is supported.

The data collected shows that 184 participants perceive high interational justice and 197 consumers perceive low interational justice. Among the 184 participants who perceive high interational justice, there are 108 complainers and 76 non-complainers. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(1,184)} = 2.836, p > 0.05$. Thus hypothesis H3c is not supported. Among the 197 participants who perceive low interational justice, there are 112 complainers and 85 non-complainers. Analysis of variance shows that $F_{(1,197)} = 3.375, p > 0.05$. Thus hypothesis H3d is not supported.

**Effect of perceived justice on recovery satisfaction**

The regression model was used to verify the hypothesis. The regression analysis was processed used SPSS for Windows. Based on the results that the three dimension of justice variables partially influence recovery satisfaction positively. Thus the results of this study fully support the hypothesis H4a. The complete results are tabulated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>26.360</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>25.760</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interational justice</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>21.628</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the dependent variable is recovery satisfaction

Multiple regression analysis was used to establish the relationship between the three dimensions of justice and recovery satisfaction. The three dimensions of justice influence recovery satisfaction simultaneously. The $R^2$ value is 0.890, suggesting very good fit of the model. Thus the results of this study support the hypothesis H4b.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

**Influence of perceive distributive justice on recovery satisfaction**

The findings confirm that the dimensions of perceived distributive justice affect on recovery satisfaction significantly ($\beta = 0.804, p < 0.05$). Thus it can be interpreted that the greater the value of compensation, the greater the consumer satisfaction. It could be realized that consumer has already spent a certain amount of money and experienced service failure in the purchase episode. Therefore it is natural that consumers tend to expect service recovery at least in the form of compensation to replace the money spent. As good as any procedures and communication
with staff, it cannot replace the loss of funds that already paid by consumers to service providers. 

This statement is supported by Smith et al. (1999) which stated that the compensation is the most influential dimension on satisfaction than the dimensions of procedural justice and interactional justice. The study also confirmed previous studies conducted by Mattila (2001) and Kau and Loh (2006) which state that the dimension of distributive justice have a positive impact on customer satisfaction. Similarly, research conducted by Gustafsson (2009) stated that when consumers received a good service recovery, they are likely to perceive a high level of justice, create positive attitude to service providers (attitudinal loyalty) and increase the likelihood of re-purchase intention in the future (behavioral loyalty).

**Influence of perceive procedural justice on recovery satisfaction**

The current study confirms that the dimensions of procedural justice perceptions affect recovery satisfaction significantly ($\beta = 0.798$, $p < 0.05$). Thus, it can be said that a better procedure would enhance perceived procedural justice positively. Further, it will enhance the recovery satisfaction.

Karande et al., (2007) in his study focus on procedural justice in the form of voice recovery. Voice Recovery is a recovery procedure in which consumers are given the opportunity to select or specify the desired recovery in the process of obtaining compensation. It is expected that with giving a voice to consumers will make them more satisfied. The emphasis in this statement is the importance of procedural fairness in dealing with service failure. Procedural fairness is important in service recovery because when consumers are satisfied with one type of recovery offered, may dissatisfied because the process to get the compensation disappoint (Kelley et al., 1993).

**Influence of perceive interactional justice on recovery satisfaction**

In delivering services, it is often not separated from the person in charge. Therefore a certain encounter often cause negative response, even the best organizations inevitably face this problem. By providing a high interaction to consumers, it is expected that consumers will feel more valued, be cared and understand the situation. This study confirms that perceived interactional justice dimension was directly affect recovery satisfaction significantly ($\beta = 0.743$, $p = 0.000$).

This study also confirms previous studies conducted by Namkung & Jang (2009) and Blodget et al. (1997) that perceived interactional justice is very important because it has a big influence on customer satisfaction. When customers experience service failure and they get a friendly and respectful treatment from service providers, they will be likely to continue repurchase the brand. Information and communication with consumers should always be maintained in order to avoid misunderstandings. Furthermore, consumers are given the opportunity to be able to follow the ongoing recovery process, so that the consumers will feel safe.
Influence of perceived justice on recovery satisfaction

In practice, each dimension of justice can not be separate partially from one another, the three dimensions of justice are interrelated and mutually supported. In the literature, the three dimensions of justice are expressed independently each other, but the combination of those dimensions can determine the overall of perceived justice and consumer behavior in the future (Blodget et al., 1997). This statement is strengthened by Erdogan (2002) who said that even though the dimensions are correlated, but they are accepted as different dimensions of justice construct. In other words, the three-dimensional of perceived justice are complementary to each other.

This study found that perceived justice dimension, either partially or simultaneously affect recovery satisfaction directly. Multiple regression analysis shows a strong relationship between perceived justice and recovery satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.791$). Of the three dimensions of justice, perceived distributive justice is the dimension that most impact on recovery satisfaction, then perceived procedural justice dimension ($\beta = 0.265$) and finally the interactional justice dimension ($\beta = 0.316$).

The current study supports previous study conducted by Smith et al. (1999) which states that the compensation (distributive justice) is the most influential antecedents on consumer satisfaction compared to elapse time during recovery process (procedural justice) and the initial response from the service provider (interactional justice). The current study is also consistent with study conducted by Spark & Kennedy (2001). In their experimental study with a hotel setting, it stated that level of customer satisfaction depends on the type of compensation, the voice given to the consumer, and the level of compliance with existing policies by the service provider.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION

The very important moment for service providers is when handling service recovery to restore customer satisfaction in service recovery process. This study offers a perspective for managers how consumers evaluate the relationship with the service provider based on the principles of justice. The results of this study will support managers to a better understanding on how the form of a fair and effective services can contribute to increased customer satisfaction.

This study present a mean value of perceived justice of non-complainers greater than complainers. In other words non-complainers who experience service failure and receive initial service recovery will perceive justice positively more than complainers. It means that proactive service providers can improve the perceived justice. When a service failure occurs, consumers do not have to ask for recovery to service providers, but on their own initiatives, the providers restore proper service recovery immediately.

The current study also shows the importance of distributive justice and interactional justice in handling service recovery. This study suggests that distributive justice is the most consumer attention, then interactional justice and finally procedural justice. The most sensitivity of consumers to service recovery is compensation. We can see on the significant difference between high distributive justice and low. Therefore, business organizations need to design a service recovery strategy in accordance with the characteristics of the product. It also needs to learn the types of compensation in accordance with the level of service failure in order to better service.
Furthermore, communications and processes are also important to be paid attention in consumer evaluations, so service recovery strategy will balance in outputs and processes.

Overall for business organizations that have defensive strategy, service recovery strategy is very effective to be implemented. With a combination of proper service recovery strategy which accepted by customers, it will lead to consumers satisfaction. It is expected that satisfied consumer will decrease intention to switch to other brand, enhance positive word of mouth communications and re-purchase intention.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Our preliminary study of experimental design found that there was no significantly different between low recovery and no recovery when the participants were distributed those service recovery scenarios. Therefore, we eliminated the non-recovery scenarios. For future research it would be interesting to test consumers who experience service failure but do not receive service recovery.

The scenario of experimental design in current study also had difficulty loading various types of compensation. The type of compensation would be determined to perceived distributive justice in order to get suitable perception of consumer need. Therefore, future studies are expected to be directed to focus on the diversity of compensation.

In the process of experiment activity, we have difficulties in gathering hundreds of people at once in the same time. In the process of data collection, we gathered participants by class before the class begins. Therefore, there is a time lag between classes. Although the possibility of communications among participants already anticipated, but it still possible that diffusion will occur. For future research it is necessary to find a better way to avoid this problem.
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